



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,556	03/04/2002	Allan Arthur Loring Bazinet	SJO920010066US1	5434

24033 7590 12/01/2005

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

MANIWANG, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2144

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/090,556

Applicant(s)

BAZINET ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph R. Maniwang

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,327,628), hereinafter referred to as Anuff.
3. Regarding claims 1, 22, and 30, Anuff disclosed a method and system for implementing security features at a portal server (see column 3, lines 40-42) comprising receiving a first request from a client; in response to receiving the first request, authenticating the client (see column 13, lines 22-38); consulting a database to determine access privileges of the authenticated client for interactions with a plurality of applications, wherein the applications are located at backend servers (see column 9, lines 24-50); generating code containing selectable interactions with the applications, wherein any authentication for the selectable interactions can be performed within the portal server (see column 1, line 59 through column 2, line 12; column 3, line 40 through column 4, line 5); and sending the code to the client (see column 3, lines 40-57).
4. Regarding claims 2, 23, and 31, Anuff further disclosed the method and system comprising responsive to sending the code to the client, receiving a second request from the client, wherein the second request contains a selection of at least one of the selectable interactions (see column 3, line 58 through column 4, line 5); determining

Art Unit: 2144

from the selection a set of backend servers to process the second request (see column 3, lines 61-65); forwarding the second request to the set of backend servers (see column 4, lines 1-5); receiving results corresponding to the request from applications executing on the backend servers (see column 4, lines 3-5); and sending the results to the client (see column 4, lines 3-5).

5. Regarding claims 3, 24, and 32, Anuff disclosed generating further selectable interactions; and sending the further selectable interactions with the results to the client (see column 13, lines 53-65).

6. Regarding claims 4 and 33, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the portal server is a Web server and the portal server comprises a portal application (see column 3, lines 40-54; column 4, lines 16-18).

7. Regarding claims 5, 25, and 34, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the database comprises a plurality of generic objects, wherein each generic object contains the access privileges related to a user for the elements of the plurality of applications (see column 9, lines 24-44).

8. Regarding claims 6 and 35, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the access privileges indicate write access (see column 9, line 65 through column 10, line 4).

9. Regarding claims 7 and 36, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the database is in the form of a table (see column 9, lines 24-40).

10. Regarding claims 8 and 37, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the code is in a form that can be rendered into a Web page (see column 7, lines 5-10).

Art Unit: 2144

11. Regarding claims 9 and 38, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the form of the code is comprised of active code, wherein the active code can be executed on the client (see column 7, lines 5-26).

12. Regarding claims 10 and 39, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the selectable interactions correspond to operations within the applications (see column 4, lines 1-5; column 13, lines 53-65).

13. Regarding claims 11 and 40, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the selectable interactions correspond to resource related to the applications (see column 4, lines 1-5; column 13, lines 53-65).

14. Regarding claims 12 and 41, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the resources are selected from the group consisting of multimedia content, objects, files, attributes of objects, program elements, database objects, table entries (see column 3, lines 61-65).

15. Regarding claims 13, 26, and 42, Anuff disclosed a method and system comprising creating data structures corresponding to interactions with the backend application (see column 1, lines 62-67; column 4, lines 23-26); associating privileges for each of the data structures, wherein the privileges can be fully checked at a portal application separately hosted from the backend application (see column 4, lines 16-18; column 9, lines 45-50); receiving a request from the portal application for reading the data structures (see column 8, lines 50-64); and sending the data structures to the portal application (see column 8, lines 47-56).

Art Unit: 2144

16. Regarding claims 14, 27, and 43, Anuff disclosed the method and system further comprising receiving a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application (see column 13, line 60); processing the request without checking for privileges (see column 13, lines 53-55, 61-62); and sending the results of processing the request to the portal server (see column 14, lines 3-9).

17. Regarding claims 15 and 44, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the data structures are data objects (see column 6, lines 22-32).

18. Regarding claims 16 and 45, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein a representation of the data structure is from the group consisting of a relational database, and XML document and a class (see column 3, lines 16-14; column 4, lines 23-28, 61-67; column 6, lines 22-46).

19. Regarding claims 17 and 46, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the interactions are operations that can be performed on the backend application (see column 4, lines 1-5; column 13, lines 53-65).

20. Regarding claims 18 and 47, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein the interactions relate to resources associated with the background application (see column 4, lines 1-5; column 13, lines 53-65).

21. Regarding claims 19, 28, and 48, Anuff disclosed a method and system comprising authenticating with a portal server (see column 9, lines 45-50; column 13, lines 32-38); receiving a list of applications and interactions that can be performed with the applications from the portal server (see column 2, lines 1-12), wherein the applications are stored at backend servers that are different from the portal server (see

column 3, lines 61-65); selecting an interaction (see column 13, lines 60-62); and receiving results based on the selection of the interaction without authenticating with the backend servers (see column 13, lines 32-48).

22. Regarding claims 20, 29, and 49, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein receiving the results further comprises receiving a set of further interactions selectable by the client (see column 13, lines 53-65).

23. Regarding claims 21 and 50, Anuff disclosed the method and system wherein authenticating, receiving the list, selecting, and receiving results are at a Web browser (see column 3, lines 11-13; column 13, lines 53-54).

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 09/15/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

25. Regarding claims 14, 18, 27, 43, and 47 previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(2), Examiner acknowledges Applicant's amendments to the claims in overcoming the rejections. The rejections have been withdrawn.

26. Regarding claims 1-50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff (U.S. Pat. No. 6,327,628), Applicant traverses the rejection.

27. Specifically, with respect to claims 1, 22, and 30, Applicant asserts that Anuff does not disclose the requirement that any authentication for the selectable interactions is performed within the portal server. However, Examiner submits that Anuff disclosed such a feature, as it was taught that only the portal server authenticated a user, and

Art Unit: 2144

each portal server page checked authentication for each selectable interaction performed by the user (see column 13, lines 32-48).

28. With respect to claims 13, 26, and 42, Applicant asserts that the reference does not teach that the privileges associated with each of the data structures are fully checked at a portal application separately hosted from the backend application.

However, Examiner submits that Anuff clearly reads upon this broad concept as it was disclosed that privileges and access rights associated with various modules and resources were controlled by the portal server application (see column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 24), and further that the portal server application was separately hosted from the backend applications hosted on other servers (see column 3, line 58 through column 4, line 5; column 4, lines 16-32). Applicant further asserts that Anuff does not teach receiving, at the backend application, a request from the portal application for reading the data structures, and sending, from the backend application, the data structures to the portal application. Examiner submits that Anuff discloses such a feature as it was disclosed that the portal server connected to the backend resources to acquire information for incorporation into the portal application (see column 4, lines 16-32).

29. Regarding claims 19, 28, and 48, Applicant asserts that Anuff does not disclose receiving results based on the selection of the interaction without authenticating with the backend servers. Examiner submits that as previously described, authentication of a user was done by the portal server (see column 13, lines 32-48); which clearly did not require further authentication with the backend servers hosting the accessed

Art Unit: 2144

applications. Results generated by a user's selection were received based on permissions associated with each selection, the permissions controlled solely by the portal application which managed such rights (see column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 24).

30. Regarding claims 2, 23, and 41, Applicant asserts that the reference does not teach receiving results corresponding to the request from applications executing on the backend servers. Examiner submits that Anuff clearly disclosed such a feature as a user could send a request to a backend application by clicking a suitable link, which then caused access to the backend application displayed on the user's browser (see column 3, lines 40-57).

31. Regarding claim 3, 24, and 32, Applicant asserts that the reference does not teach sending further selectable interactions with the results to the client. Examiner submits that Anuff clearly disclosed such a feature as the portal page could contain multiple modules and links (see column 3, lines 40-57; Fig. 2), which read upon the broad concept of sending further selectable interactions as claimed.

32. Regarding claims 7, 25, and 36, Applicant asserts that Anuff does not teach that the database is in the form of a table. Examiner submits that as the broad definition of a table is a collection of records in a relational database, Anuff reads upon such a feature since user permissions were stored as objects in a database (see column 9, lines 24-40).

33. Regarding claims 10, 25, and 39, Applicant asserts that Anuff does not teach or disclose the limitation that applications, the operations within the applications, and the

Art Unit: 2144

resources related to the applications are displayed on a single Web page. Examiner submits that Anuff undoubtedly disclosed such a feature as Anuff disclosed the use of a portal server, one in which modules, their links, and their associated resources were displayed on a single portal web page (see column 3, lines 40-57; Fig. 2).

34. Regarding claims 12 and 41, Applicant submits that Anuff does not teach or disclose multimedia content, attributes of objects, or table entries. Examiner submits that Anuff did disclose such features as multimedia content (see column 3, line 47-49), attributes of objects (see column 3, lines 45-47), and table entries (see column 3, lines 61-65) as broadly claimed.

35. Regarding claims 14, 27, and 43, Applicant submits that Anuff does not teach receiving a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application. Examiner submits Anuff taught such a feature as it was disclosed that the portal server connected to the backend resources to acquire information for incorporation into the portal application (see column 4, lines 16-32). A request in this instance is inherent as it would be required in order to access backend information.

36. Regarding claims 17 and 46, Applicant asserts that Anuff did not disclose the limitation that the backend application, the operations that can be performed on the backend application, and the resources related to the backend application are displayed on a single Web page on a client. Examiner submits that Anuff undoubtedly disclosed such a feature as Anuff disclosed the use of a portal server, one in which modules, their links, and their associated resources were displayed on a single portal web page (see column 3, lines 40-57; Fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2144

37. Regarding claims 20, 29, and 49, Applicant asserts that Anuff does not teach or disclose the limitation that the portal server performs all necessary authentications of the client computer, and wherein the backend servers avoid any authentication of the client computer. However as argued above, Examiner submits that authentication of a user was done by the portal server (see column 13, lines 32-48), which clearly did not require further authentication with the backend servers hosting the accessed applications. Results generated by a user's selection were received based on permissions associated with each selection, the permissions controlled solely by the portal application with managed such rights (see column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 24).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2144

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R. Maniwang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3928. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100